



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/557,539	11/21/2005	Martin Eberle	104610-55275(22009)	2151
26345 GIBBONS P.C. ONE GATEWAY CENTER NEWARK, NJ 07102	7590 04/04/2007		EXAMINER STOCKTON, LAURA LYNNE	
			ART UNIT 1626	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS		NOTIFICATION DATE 04/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/04/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

thibbits@gibbonslaw.com
abriggs@gibbonslaw.com
IPDocket@gibbonslaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/557,539	EBERLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	1626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 15 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 13, 16 and 17 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The references cited in the Search Report have been considered, but will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application because they were not provided on a separate list in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). In order to have the references printed on such resulting patent, a separate listing, preferably on a PTO/SB/08A and 08B form, must be filed within the set period for reply to this Office action.

It is noted that an Information Disclosure Statement had not been filed at the time of this Office Action. It is suggested that if Applicant(s) intend to file an IDS that it be filed when responding to this Office Action.

Oath/Declaration

The Declaration fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.497(a) (2) since PCT/IB04/01723 filed May 19, 2004 is not identified in the Declaration.

Applicant is required to submit a substitute declaration or oath to correct the deficiencies set forth in this communication.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim can only refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.*

v. Brenner, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3, 19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 lacks antecedent basis from claim 2 because of R¹ and R² independently representing an "optionally substituted phenylcarbonyl".

In claim 19, it is unclear what is meant by a "derivative thereof" or a "protected derivative" and

therefore, the metes and bounds of the claim cannot be ascertained.

In claim 19, the "and/or" should be changed to an "or".

Claim 19 is indefinite since it is not stated how the "obtainable compound of formula (I) is converted into another compound of formula (I)".

Claims 21 and 22 provide for the use of a compound of formula (I), but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections
set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, 14, 15 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harbeson et al. {US 2004/0034037}.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Applicant claims benzimidazole compounds. Harbeson et al. teach benzimidazole compounds that are structurally similar to the instant claimed compounds (see Formula I on page 2; Formula Ia on page 5; pages 2-4, 20-22 and 24; and especially Compounds 1, 4 and 6 on page 6 and Compounds 21, 24 and 26 on page 8).

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the compounds of the prior art and the compounds instantly claimed is that the instant claimed compounds are generically described in the prior art.

Finding of prima facie obviousness--rational and motivation (MPEP §2142-2413)

The indiscriminate selection of "some" among "many" is *prima facie* obvious, In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964). The motivation to make the claimed compounds derives from the expectation that structurally similar compounds would possess similar activity (e.g., treating asthma).

One skilled in the art would thus be motivated to prepare products embraced by the prior art to arrive at the instant claimed products with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial products which would be useful in treating, for example, asthma. The instant

claimed invention would have been suggested to one skilled in the art and therefore, the instant claimed invention would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

In the instant specification on page 55, starting at line 4, Applicant has compared the activity of the instant claimed compounds against two of the compounds in WO 03/066629. This WO is in the same patent family as Harbeson et al. {US 2004/0034037}. The showing is not persuasive since Applicant did not compare the closest compounds in Harbeson et al. Note that compounds such as Compounds 1, 4 and 6 on page 6 and Compounds 21, 24 and 26 on page 8 in Harbeson et al. are structurally closer to the instant claimed compounds than the two compounds of Example A and B found in Table 5 on page 55 of the instant specification. Applicant relying upon comparative

showing to rebut *prima facie* case must compare his claimed invention with the closest prior art. *In re Holladay*, 199 USPQ 516, 1978.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura L. Stockton whose telephone number is (571) 272-0710. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:15 am to 2:45 pm. If the examiner is out of the Office, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane, can be reached on (571) 272-0699.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either

Art Unit: 1626

Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

The Official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.



Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1626, Group 1620
Technology Center 1600

March 29, 2007